

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 40-59 were pending in the application, of which Claims 40 and 50 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated June 20, 2007, Claims 40-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 40-58 and 60 remain in this application with Claim 59 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claim 60 being added by this Amendment. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated June 20, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 40 and 45-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,361,361 ("*Hickman*") in view of what the Examiner considers to be Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Managing On-line Help ("*Irwin*"). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected Claims 50 and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hickman* in view of what the Examiner considers to be AAPA in view of *Irwin* in view of PDF Reference Manual Version 1.2 ("*PDF Reference Manual*"). Claims 40 and 50 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome these rejections and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 40 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "each vendor folder containing help contents of respective help topics provided by a corresponding vendor, the help contents usable by

a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics.” Amended Claim 50 includes a similar recitation.

In contrast, *Hickman* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Hickman* merely discloses a hierarchical integrated help utility that integrates help information across multiple independent applications. (See col. 1, lines 52-53.) *Hickman* alleges that it improves conventional help utility functionality by providing help file directory 313 within application 310, help file directory 323 within application 320, and the integrated help utility 340. (See col. 4, lines 30-34.) While *Hickman* states that it integrates help information across multiple independent applications, nowhere in *Hickman* does it disclose help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics. Consequently, *Hickman* is completely silent regarding a unified taxonomy structure, much less help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure.

Furthermore, *Irwin* does not overcome *Hickman*’s deficiencies. *Irwin* merely discloses managing on-line help in a networked multi-platform environment. Like *Hickman*, *Irwin* at least does not teach or suggest help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics.

Moreover, what the Examiner considers to be AAPA does not overcome *Hickman*’s and *Irwin*’s deficiencies. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner states that what the Examiner considers AAPA discloses “specifically, help information regarding a software program of a hardware device may be organized by the vendor of that product into different help topics that a user can access and view on the computer.” (See Final Office Action, page 9, lines 1-4.) While the aforementioned statement by the Examiner

may state that help information may be organized by a product vendor of that into different help topics, nowhere does it suggest or disclose help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics. Consequently, like *Hickman* and *Irwin*, what the Examiner considers to be AAPA at least does not teach or suggest help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics.

Furthermore, *PDF Reference Manual* does not overcome *Hickman's*, *Irwin's*, and what the Examiner considers AAPA's deficiencies. *PDF Reference Manual* merely discloses portable document format files structures. Like *Hickman*, *Irwin*, and what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *PDF Reference Manual* at least does not teach or suggest help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics.

Combining *Hickman* with what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *PDF Reference Manual*, and *Irwin* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Hickman*, what the Examiner considers to be AAPA, *PDF Reference Manual*, and *Irwin*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "each vendor folder containing help contents of respective help topics provided by a corresponding vendor, the help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics," as recited by amended Claim 40. Amended Claim 50 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 40 and 50 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of Claims 40 and 50.

Dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-58 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 40 and 50, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 40 and 50. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-58.

## II. New Claim

Claim 60 has been added to more distinctly define and to round out the protection for the invention to which Applicants are entitled. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable over the cited art and that it adds no new matter.

## III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: October 30, 2007

---

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

